

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 9, 10 and 12 are amended. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in Fig. 7A and paragraph [0027], for example. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Vetter during the telephone interview on January 22, 2009, are appreciated. The reasons presented during the telephone interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated in the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 1-6 are amended, obviating the rejection. Regarding claims 8 and 9, "[T]here is nothing inherently wrong with defining some part of an invention in functional terms." See MPEP 2173.05(g). This MPEP section further indicates that "[a] functional limitation is often used in association with an element, ingredient, or step of a process to define a particular capability or purpose that is served by the recited element, ingredient or step." In view of these passages, there is nothing inherently wrong with the limitations recited in claims 8 and 9.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112 are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Japanese Patent Publication No. 09-035129 to Shindo, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,137,043 to Kane in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,043,561 to Kimata; rejects claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shindo in view of Kane and Kimata, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,983,197 to Enta; and rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shindo in view of

Kane and Kimata, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2001/0016825 to Pugliese. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Shindo discloses that the printed information includes a unique identifier identifying an instance of the automated process in which the error was encountered. Shindo does not disclose that the printed information includes a unique identifier identifying a particular passenger's kiosk session with a CLF engine layer, as recited in claim 1 and the remaining independent claims.

While the Office Action does not explicitly point to what portion of Shindo corresponds to the unique identifier, the Office Action appears to rely on the "window reservation sequence number 19" (Fig. 2). The window reservation sequence number 19 is merely a sequential placeholder, such as "1, 2, 3, 4 ..." (Fig. 2). The placeholder is analogous to the placeholder numbers that one receives at the Department of Motor Vehicles when waiting in line. The placeholder determines the order in which people may see a clerk for assistance. The placeholder does not, however, identify a particular passenger's kiosk session with a CLF engine layer.

In contrast, this application discloses a lengthy alphanumeric session ID 68 that identifies a particular passenger's kiosk session with a CLF layer (Fig. 7A, paragraph [0027]). Shindo does not disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, this recited feature. Further, the remaining applied references are not applied in any manner that would overcome the above-identified shortfall in the application of Shindo to the subject matter of the pending claims.

During the telephone interview held on January 22, 2009, Examiner Vetter indicated that claim amendments reciting "a particular passenger's kiosk session with a CLF engine layer" overcome the current rejections, because the applied references do not disclose, and

would not have suggested, this feature. Accordingly, Examiner Vetter indicated that he will withdraw the rejections and conduct an updated search.


In view of the above, the combinations of applied references would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1, 10 and 12. Thus, the combinations of applied references would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in the dependent claims for at least their respective dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Pardini
Registration No. 30,411

Kipman T. Werking
Registration No. 60,187

TJP:KTW/acd

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 26, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461